

REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action, mailed January 24, 2008, considered and rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koponen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0235503 A1).

By this response, claims 1, 4-11, 19, 21-23, 25, and 26 are amended, while claims 12, 13, 15-18, 20, 24, 27, and 28 are canceled. Claims 1-11, 14, 19, 21-23, and 25 remain pending of which claims 1, 14, and 23 are independent.

As reflected by the claims, the present invention is generally directed to embodiments for filtering messages received by a message-handling program by leveraging the existing message-handling architecture of computer devices to trigger events and perform actions instead of displaying the messages. The message-handling architecture passes messages to rule clients which extract information from the messages and pass the information to separate applications. A rule client registers to receive messages by registering a DLL in the system registry as a COM object. In this way, the rule client is loaded each time a message is received.

One example of the foregoing is recited in claim 1, wherein the message-handling mechanism receives and flags a message to indicate that the message should be passed to a rule client that has registered to receive flagged messages. The rule client registers by loading a DLL in the registry. The rule client is called and passed the message. The rule client then processes the message by extracting information that is then passed to an application program distinct from the message-handling mechanism. The rule client then sends data to the message-handling mechanism indicating whether the message may be passed to another rule client or discarded. Independent claim 14 is directed to a corresponding computer-readable storage medium for performing the method of claim 1 and independent claim 23 is directed to a corresponding system that is configured for performing a similar method.

Initially, it is noted that claims 23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being incomplete for purportedly omitting essential elements and for only reciting software limitations as computing systems. However, these rejections are now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 27 and in view of the amendments to claim 23, wherein claim 23 has been amended to at least including a physical storage component. In addition, Applicant submits that the message-handling mechanism consists partially of hardware, when the claims are interpreted in view of the specification. *See* para. 0030.

Claim 23 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for purportedly being drawn to non-statutory subject matter. However, Applicant submits that, in view of the current amendments, the same argument with respect to the § 112 rejection is also sufficient to overcome the §101 rejection. In particular, claim 23 is clearly directed to a tangible and useful computing system that is not merely an abstract idea.

Now, with regard to the substantive rejections, it is noted that claims 1-28 were rejected as being anticipated by Koponen. Applicant submits, however, that in view of the current amendments, Koponen fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims.

Koponen discloses the processing of messages at an SMS-gateway. Users are allowed to define classifications for messages and provide instructions to be applied to messages falling into the classifications. However, Koponen does not teach or suggest that the filtering mechanism may be integrated to leverage the existing architecture. In other words, Koponen does not teach or suggest that a rule client registers a DLL (dynamic-link library) as a COM object (component object model object) in the system registry so that the rule client is loaded when messages are received by the message-handling mechanism, as claimed, for example, in combination with the other recited claim elements. Koponen only discloses that codes (or processing rules) are run to determine how to classify messages and that based on the classification, the messages will be processed accordingly. There is no suggestion or motivation provided in the known art to leverage any existing message-handling architecture as the current invention claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.¹ For example, there are many limitations presented in the dependent claims that further

¹ Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting any official notice taken. Furthermore, although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

distinguish the claims from the cited art, including, but not limited to the limitations presented in claim 6 wherein upon determining that the data indicates that the message may be provided to the next rule client, determining whether there is a next rule client in the set of at least one rule client, and if so providing the message to the next rule client.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 24th day of April, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973